

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,187	10/16/2003	Steven S. Homer	200309431-1	7568
22879	7590 01/31/2006		EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY			DATSKOVSKIY, MICHAEL V	
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	<u> </u>

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/687,187 HOMER ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Michael V. Datskovskiy	2835	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was preply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 December</u> This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under Exercise 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-27 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-27 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11).	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/687,187

Art Unit: 2835

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14, 16-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reames et al (US Patent 6,174,482).

Reames et al teach a personal computer (col. 6, lines 38-54), comprising: a housing having a perimeter edge; a controller inherently located within the housing; and a display (Figs. 13-16) having a top surface extending to the perimeter edge, wherein the top surface of a glass panel 112 and the perimeter edge 127 form an uninterrupted and smooth transition.

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 9, 16, 18-20, 21-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohgami et al (Previously cited US Patent5,574,625).

Ohgami et al teach a tablet personal computer, Figs. 1-8, comprising: a housing 12 having a rectangle perimeter edge 11; a controller (microprocessor) inherently located within the housing; and a touch-screen display having a top surface 18 extending to the perimeter edge 11, wherein the top surface and the perimeter edge form an uninterrupted and smooth transition, and wherein the housing comprises a base wall 14b disposed generally parallel to the display surface 18. Ohgami et al teach

Application/Control Number: 10/687,187

Art Unit: 2835

furthermore said tablet computer further comprises: a graphical user interface 64 located beneath the display panel 18; a pointer/stylus 26 adapted to actuate the graphical user interface; a pad 62 disposed between the display panel 18 and the housing 12. Regarding to the claims 16, 18-20 and 24-25: The method steps are inherently necessitated by the device structure as Yang et al disclosed it.

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 16, 18-22 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yang et al (Previously cited US Patent 6,781,819).

Yang et al teach a rectangular tablet personal computer, Figs. 2-13, comprising: a housing 100 having a rectangle perimeter edge; a controller (microprocessor) inherently located within the housing; a graphical user interface inherently located beneath a display panel; and a touch-screen digitized display (Fig. 9A) having a top surface extending to the perimeter edge of the housing 100, wherein the top surface and the perimeter edge form an uninterrupted and smooth transition, and wherein the housing comprises a base wall 14 disposed generally parallel to the display surface. Yang et al teach furthermore said tablet computer further comprising a keyboard 300 removably attached to the housing 100 at the perimeter edge. Regarding to the claims 16, 18-20 and 24-25: The method steps are inherently necessitated by the device structure as Ohgami et al disclosed it.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,187

Art Unit: 2835

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 2, 5-6, 8, 10-14, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohgami et al in view of Hashimoto (US Patent 5,442,470).

 Ohgami et al teach all the limitations of the claims except said top protective panel 18 is made of glass (by Ohgami et al it is made of a transparent acrylic plate). Hoshimoto teaches a notebook computer, Fig.9, comprising a protective top panel 15 made of glass (col. 9, line 59 through col. 10, line 3). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time invention was made to make a top protective panel in the device by Ohgami et al from glass as it is disclosed by Hoshimoto in order to improve protection of the LCD display.
- 7. Claims 2, 5-6 and 17 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Y**ang et al.

Yang et al teach all the limitations of the claims except a top display panel is made of glass. Hoshimoto teaches a notebook computer, Fig.9, comprising a protective top panel 15 made of glass (col. 9, line 59 through col. 10, line 3). It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time invention was made to make a top display panel in the device by Yang et al from glass as it is disclosed by Hoshimoto in order to improve protection of the LCD display.

Application/Control Number: 10/687,187

Art Unit: 2835

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Examiner points out that due to the extremely broad character of the most of the claims, numerous prior art references, including for example, previously cited Shioya et al, Ohgami et al, Uchida, Yang et al, Tanaka et al and Matsumoto; and newly cited references by: Reavey et al (US Patent 5,847,698); Haneda et al (US Patent 5,900,848) Kuno et al (US Patent 5,467,102) and Mueller (DE 20113314 U1) all are applicable for the rejection of the at least claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 16, 18-22 and 25-26 of the instant application. These references could be used because all of them show a personal computer, wherein a housing perimeter edge and a top surface of a display forming an uninterrupted and smooth transition; all of them inherently comprise a controller

Art Unit: 2835

(microprocessor) and all are tablet type of computers, inherently having digitized touch screens and pen/stylus touch screen pointing actuators.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V. Datskovskiy whose telephone number is (571) 272-2040. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn Feild can be reached on (571) 272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mul Datsheir

Michael V Datskovskiy Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2835

01/27/2006